



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/376,875	08/18/1999	GREGORY M. CHRYSLER	884.148US1	7059

7590

06/04/2002

SCHWEGMAN LUNDBERG WOESSNER & KLUTH PA
P O BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

ATKINSON, CHRISTOPHER MARK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3743

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED:

18

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/12/02 + 3/4/02

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-9 and 22-24 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-9 and 22-24 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES -

Art Unit: 3743

Response to RCE and Amendment

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1-2, 5-9 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jean or Morosas in view of Lee and Yeh.

The patent of Jean, in Figures 3-6, and the patent of Morosas, in Figures 1-5 disclose all

Art Unit: 3743

the claimed features with the exception of the folded fin having semi-circular arches and a clip.

The patent of Lee discloses that it is known to have a folded fin having semi-circular arches for the purpose of reducing pressure losses within the fluid flowing over the arches. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Jean or Morosas semi-circular arches for the purpose of reducing pressure losses within the fluid flowing over the arches as disclosed in Lee. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the claimed materials, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

The patent of Yeh in Figure 2 discloses that it is known to have a clip which couples physically and thermally a heat sink to a base for the purpose of providing a secure and elastic connection between the heat sink and the base. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Jean or Morosas a clip which couples physically and thermally the heat sink to the base for the purpose of obtaining a secure and elastic connection between the heat sink and the base as disclosed in Yeh.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Jean or Morosas in view of Lee and Yeh as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Bishop et al. The device of Jean or Morosas fail to teach a second fan.


The patent of Bishop et al. in Figure 1 discloses that it is known to have both first and

Art Unit: 3743

second fans for the purpose of enhancing the convective heat transfer of the heat sink. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ in Jean or Morosas a second fan for the purpose of enhancing the convective heat transfer of the heat sink as disclosed in Bishop et al.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Atkinson whose telephone number is (703) 308-2603.


C.A.

June 2, 2002

CHRISTOPHER ATKINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER